

# VIEWING FINITE DIMENSIONAL REPRESENTATIONS THROUGH INFINITE DIMENSIONAL ONES

DIETER HAPPEL AND BIRGE HUISGEN-ZIMMERMANN

*Dedicated to the memory of Maurice Auslander*

**ABSTRACT.** We develop criteria for deciding the contravariant finiteness status of a subcategory  $\mathfrak{A} \subseteq \Lambda\text{-mod}$ , where  $\Lambda$  is a finite dimensional algebra. In particular, given a finite dimensional  $\Lambda$ -module  $X$ , we introduce a certain class of modules – we call them  $A$ -phantoms of  $X$  – which indicate whether or not  $X$  has a right  $A$ -approximation: We prove that  $X$  fails to have such an approximation if and only if  $X$  has infinite-dimensional  $A$ -phantoms. Moreover, we demonstrate that large phantoms encode a great deal of additional information about  $X$  and  $A$  and that they are highly accessible, due to the fact that the class of all  $A$ -phantoms of  $X$  is closed under subfactors and direct limits.

## 1. INTRODUCTION AND PRELIMINARIES

Given a finite dimensional algebra  $\Lambda$  and a resolving contravariantly finite subcategory  $\mathfrak{A}$  of the category  $\Lambda\text{-mod}$  of finitely generated left  $\Lambda$ -modules, the minimal right  $\mathfrak{A}$ -approximations of the simple left  $\Lambda$ -modules provide significant structural information about arbitrary objects of  $\mathfrak{A}$ : Indeed, if these approximations are labeled  $A_1, \dots, A_n$ , then a finitely generated  $\Lambda$ -module  $M$  belongs to  $\mathfrak{A}$  if and only if  $M$  is a direct summand of a module that has a filtration with consecutive factors in  $\{A_1, \dots, A_n\}$ ; this was proved by Auslander and Reiten [2]. (For the basic definitions, see under ‘Preliminaries’ below.) Among other consequences, this result has an obvious homological pay-off: Namely, if all of the  $A_i$  have finite projective dimensions, then the maximum of these dimensions coincides with the supremum of the projective dimensions attained on objects of  $\mathfrak{A}$ .

Our main interest will be in the category  $\mathfrak{A} = \mathcal{P}^\infty(\Lambda\text{-mod})$  of finitely generated  $\Lambda$ -modules of finite projective dimension, even though many of our results will address the situation of an arbitrary subcategory of  $\Lambda\text{-mod}$  which is closed under finite direct sums. Loosely speaking, the category  $\mathcal{P}^\infty(\Lambda\text{-mod})$  will be contravariantly finite in  $\Lambda\text{-mod}$  if it is either very large or very small; for example, by [3], every representation-finite subcategory of  $\Lambda\text{-mod}$  is contravariantly finite. There are several classes of algebras for which the problem of whether  $\mathcal{P}^\infty(\Lambda\text{-mod})$  is contravariantly finite in  $\Lambda\text{-mod}$  is settled, e.g., for

---

The research of the second author was partially supported by a grant from the National Science Foundation. Part of this work was done while the first author was visiting UCSB. He would like to thank his coauthor for her kind hospitality.

left serial algebras, it is settled in the positive [4]. However, in general, it is difficult to decide whether  $\mathcal{P}^\infty(\Lambda\text{-mod})$  for a given algebra  $\Lambda$  has this property. In particular, there is only a single instance for which failure of contravariant finiteness of  $\mathcal{P}^\infty(\Lambda\text{-mod})$  has actually been established; this is an example of a monomial relation algebra, due to Igusa, Smalø, and Todorov [9], which is so closely related to the Kronecker algebra that a proof for failure of contravariant finiteness of  $\mathcal{P}^\infty(\Lambda\text{-mod})$  can be gleaned from the representation theory of this latter algebra (of course, for the Kronecker algebra itself, as for any algebra  $\Lambda$  of finite global dimension, we know that  $\mathcal{P}^\infty(\Lambda\text{-mod}) = \Lambda\text{-mod}$  is contravariantly finite). The present research was triggered by a question of M. Auslander as to whether, for the monomial relation algebra with differing big and little finitistic dimensions which was exhibited by the second author in [8],  $\mathcal{P}^\infty(\Lambda\text{-mod})$  is contravariantly finite. This specific problem turned out to be rather intractable without a systematic theory providing direction.

Our goal here is twofold. On one hand, we establish ‘negative criteria’ for the contravariant finiteness of subcategories  $\mathfrak{A}$  of  $\Lambda\text{-mod}$ . These criteria are particularly manageable in the case of monomial relation algebras, and one of them yields a negative answer to the specific question mentioned above. On the other hand – maybe more importantly – our investigation reveals that, for non-contravariantly finite subcategories  $\mathfrak{A}$  of  $\Lambda\text{-mod}$ , certain modules of infinite dimension over the base field take over the role which is played by the minimal right  $\mathfrak{A}$ -approximations in the contravariantly finite case. We call these modules ‘ $\mathfrak{A}$ -phantoms’ and define them as follows: Given a subclass  $\mathfrak{C}$  of  $\mathfrak{A}$  and a finitely generated left  $\Lambda$ -module  $X$ , we label as  $\mathfrak{C}$ -approximation of  $X$  inside  $\mathfrak{A}$  any homomorphism  $f : A \rightarrow X$  with  $A \in \mathfrak{A}$  having the property that each homomorphism  $g : C \rightarrow X$  with  $C \in \mathfrak{C}$  factors through  $f$ . Moreover, a  $\Lambda$ -module  $H$ , not necessarily in  $\mathfrak{A}$ , is called an  $\mathfrak{A}$ -phantom of  $X$  in case there exists a non-empty finite subclass  $\mathfrak{C}$  of  $\mathfrak{A}$  such that each  $\mathfrak{C}$ -approximation of  $X$  inside  $\mathfrak{A}$  has  $H$  as a subfactor; direct limits of such modules  $H$  are again called  $\mathfrak{A}$ -phantoms of  $X$ . In case  $X$  has a right  $\mathfrak{A}$ -approximation, the  $\mathfrak{A}$ -phantoms of  $X$  are clearly just the subfactors of the minimal right  $\mathfrak{A}$ -approximation of  $X$ . For an intuitive idea of the information stored in such phantoms, suppose for the moment that  $X = S$  is simple; comparable to the minimal right  $\mathfrak{A}$ -approximation of  $S$  (in case of existence), the  $\mathfrak{A}$ -phantoms of  $S$  represent, in as highly compressed a form as possible, the relations characterizing those objects of  $\mathfrak{A}$  which carry  $S$  in their tops. In essence, our negative criteria give instructions for the uncovering of phantoms which are too big (namely, non-finitely generated) to be compatible with contravariant finiteness of  $\mathfrak{A}$ . Our main result (Theorem 9) ensures existence in general: Namely, we prove that, for any subcategory  $\mathfrak{A}$  of  $\Lambda\text{-mod}$  which is closed under finite direct sums, a finitely generated  $\Lambda$ -module  $X$  fails to have a right  $\mathfrak{A}$ -approximation if and only if  $X$  has  $\mathfrak{A}$ -phantoms of infinite dimension over the base field.

The core of the paper is Section 3. The concepts introduced at the beginning of that section appear cogent in the light of the preliminary criterion for failure of contravariant finiteness presented in Section 2 and its applications to special cases. We present several examples to illustrate how phantoms mark the dividing line between contravariant finiteness and failure thereof, and to show concretely what type of information they store. These ex-

amples also indicate how sensitive the property of contravariant finiteness of  $\mathcal{P}^\infty(\Lambda\text{-mod})$  in  $\Lambda\text{-mod}$  is, with respect to modifications of the relations of the underlying algebra.


*Acknowledgment:* The authors would like to thank Sverre Smalø for his careful reading of a preliminary manuscript and several helpful suggestions.

*Prerequisites:* Throughout,  $\Lambda$  will denote a basic finite dimensional algebra over a field  $K$ , with a fixed set of primitive idempotents,  $e_1, \dots, e_n$ , and  $J$  will be the Jacobson radical of  $\Lambda$ . The simple left  $\Lambda$ -modules  $\Lambda e_i / J e_i$  will be abbreviated by  $S_i$ . Moreover,  $\Lambda\text{-mod}$  will stand for the category of all finitely generated left  $\Lambda$ -modules, and  $\Lambda\text{-Mod}$  for the category of *all* left  $\Lambda$ -modules.


Let  $\mathfrak{A}$  be a full subcategory of  $\Lambda\text{-mod}$ . Following Auslander/Smalø [3] and Auslander/Reiten [2], we say that a module  $M \in \Lambda\text{-mod}$  has a (right)  $\mathfrak{A}$ -*approximation* in case there exists a homomorphism  $\varphi : A \rightarrow M$  with  $A \in \mathfrak{A}$  such that each homomorphism  $B \rightarrow M$  with  $B \in \mathfrak{A}$  factors through  $\varphi$ . By [2], existence of any  $\mathfrak{A}$ -approximation of  $M$  entails existence of a *minimal*  $\mathfrak{A}$ -approximation of  $M$ , i.e., one of minimal  $K$ -dimension, which is unique up to isomorphism. If each object in  $\Lambda\text{-mod}$  has an  $\mathfrak{A}$ -approximation, then  $\mathfrak{A}$  is said to be *contravariantly finite* in  $\Lambda\text{-mod}$  (see [2,3]). Our favorite choice of a subcategory  $\mathfrak{A} \subseteq \Lambda\text{-mod}$  will be the subcategory of all finitely generated left  $\Lambda$ -modules of finite projective dimension; we label it  $\mathcal{P}^\infty(\Lambda\text{-mod})$ . Finally, we call a module category  $\mathfrak{A} \subseteq \Lambda\text{-mod}$  *resolving* in case  $\mathfrak{A}$  is closed under extensions, as well as kernels of epimorphisms, and contains all indecomposable projective left  $\Lambda$ -modules. Clearly,  $\mathcal{P}^\infty(\Lambda\text{-mod})$  is an instance of a resolving subcategory of  $\Lambda\text{-mod}$ .

Given a module  $M \in \Lambda\text{-Mod}$ , we call an element  $m \in M$  a *top element* of  $M$  if  $m \in M \setminus JM$  and  $e_i m = m$  for some  $i$ ; in this case, we also say that  $m$  is a top element *of type*  $e_i$ . In all of our examples,  $\Lambda$  will be a split finite dimensional algebra over  $K$ , that is,  $\Lambda$  will be of the form  $K\Gamma/I$  where  $\Gamma$  is a quiver and  $I$  an admissible ideal in the path algebra  $K\Gamma$ . We will briefly and informally review the second author's conventions for the graphical communication of information about countably generated  $\Lambda$ -modules. For additional detail, see [7,8]. (We point out that our labeled graphs are related to the module diagrams studied by Alperin [1] and Fuller [5].)

Let  $\Gamma$  be the quiver



and  $\Lambda = K\Gamma/\langle \rho^2 \rangle$ . To say that a left  $\Lambda$ -module  $M$  has the *layered and labeled graph* shown below,



with respect to a sequence  $m_1, m_2, m_3, m_4$  of top elements of  $M$  which are  $K$ -linearly independent modulo  $JM$ , is to convey the following information:

- $M/JM \cong S_1^2 \oplus S_2 \oplus S_3$ , the top elements  $m_i$  of  $M$  have type  $e_i$  for  $i = 1, 2, 3$ , and  $m_4$  has type  $e_1$ ;
- $JM/J^2M \cong S_4^3$ , the three copies of  $S_4$  modulo  $J^2M$  being generated by  $\alpha m_1$ ,  $\beta m_1$ ,  $\epsilon m_3$ , and such that  $\gamma m_2$  is congruent to a nonzero scalar multiple of  $\beta m_1$  modulo  $J^2M$ , and  $\alpha m_4$  congruent to a nonzero scalar multiple of  $\epsilon m_3$ ;
- $J^2M/J^3M = J^2M \cong S_4$  is generated by  $\rho \alpha m_1$ , and is also generated by any of the elements  $\rho \beta m_1$ ,  $\rho \gamma m_2$ , or  $\delta m_3$ .

Finally, we will consider the following two finitistic dimensions of  $\Lambda$ : the *left little finitistic dimension*,  $\text{lfin dim } \Lambda$ , which is the supremum of the finite projective dimensions attained on  $\Lambda\text{-mod}$ , and the *left big finitistic dimension*,  $\text{lFin dim } \Lambda$ , which stands for the analogous supremum attained on all of  $\Lambda\text{-Mod}$ .

## 2. A FEW MOTIVATING EXAMPLES

In this section, we specialize to the situation where the algebra  $\Lambda$  is split, i.e., we assume throughout that  $\Lambda = K\Gamma/I$  is a path algebra modulo relations. We start by exhibiting an elementary sufficient condition for failure of contravariant finiteness of  $\mathcal{P}^\infty(\Lambda\text{-mod})$  in  $\Lambda\text{-mod}$ . In our first example we will apply it to the algebra constructed by Igusa/Smalø/Todorov [9], which provided the first known instance of such failure. While this criterion is quite easy to handle, its scope is rather limited, and it will later be supplemented by a criterion of far wider applicability.

For convenience of exposition, we will often view left  $\Lambda$ -modules  $M$  as representations of the quiver  $\Gamma$  satisfying the commutativity relations dictated by  $I$ ; given a path  $p : e_1 \rightarrow e_2$  in  $K\Gamma$ , we will in that case, write  $f_p : e_1 M \rightarrow e_2 M$  for the  $K$ -linear map corresponding to  $p$ .

**Elementary Criterion 1.** *Let  $\Lambda = K\Gamma/I$ . Suppose that  $e_1$  and  $e_2$  are vertices of the quiver  $\Gamma$  (not necessarily distinct) and  $p, q \in K\Gamma \setminus I$  paths from  $e_1$  to  $e_2$  with  $\Lambda p \cap \Lambda q = 0$  (we view  $p$  and  $q$  as elements of  $\Lambda$  whenever indicated by the context). Moreover, suppose that*

(i) *the cyclic module  $\Lambda(p, q)$  generated by the element  $(p, q) \in \Lambda^2$  has finite projective dimension,*

*and that one of the following two conditions is satisfied: either,*

(ii) *whenever  $M \in \mathcal{P}^\infty(\Lambda\text{-mod})$ , then  $f_p(e_1 M \setminus JM) \cap f_q(e_1 JM) = \emptyset$ ;*

or,

(ii') whenever  $M \in \mathcal{P}^\infty(\Lambda\text{-mod})$ , then  $\ker(f_p) \subseteq \ker(f_q)$ , and  $\ker(f_p) \subseteq e_1 JM$ .

Then the simple module  $S_1 = \Lambda e_1 / J e_1$  does not have a right  $\mathcal{P}^\infty(\Lambda\text{-mod})$ -approximation.

Before we justify the criterion, we point out that the second part of Criterion 1(ii') can often be verified without effort; we label it as follows:

(iii) Whenever  $M$  in  $\mathcal{P}^\infty(\Lambda\text{-mod})$ , then  $\ker(f_p) \subseteq e_1 JM$ .

Indeed, suppose that  $p$  is an arrow such that  $\Lambda p$  splits off in  $J e_1$  (this is obviously true when  $\Lambda$  is a monomial relation algebra). Then Condition (iii) holds if and only if  $\text{p dim } \Lambda p = \infty$ . For, if  $\text{p dim } \Lambda p = \infty$  and  $M \in \Lambda\text{-mod}$  contains a top element of type  $e_1$  which is annihilated by  $p$ , then  $\Lambda p$  is isomorphic to a direct summand of  $\Omega^1(M)$ , which entails that  $\text{p dim } M = \infty$ . If, on the other hand,  $\text{p dim } \Lambda p < \infty$ , then the module  $M = \Lambda / \Lambda p$  violates Condition (iii).

A readily recognizable situation in which the blanket hypothesis of the criterion, as well as conditions (i) and (ii) are satisfied is as follows:  $p$  is an arrow  $e_1 \rightarrow e_2$ ,  $q \in K\Gamma \setminus I$  a path from  $e_1$  to  $e_2$  of positive length which is different from  $p$  such that  $Jp = qJ = 0$ , and  $\text{p dim } \Lambda q < \infty$ , while  $\text{p dim } \Lambda e_2 / J e_2 = \infty$ .

*Proof of Criterion 1.* We start by assuming the blanket hypothesis of the criterion and condition (i) to construct an infinite family of objects  $(N_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  in  $\mathcal{P}^\infty(\Lambda\text{-mod})$ . Namely, for  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , we let  $b_1 = \cdots = b_n = e_1$ , define a left  $\Lambda$ -module

$$N_n := \left( \bigoplus_{i=1}^n \Lambda b_i \right) / \left( \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \Lambda (pb_i - qb_{i+1}) \right),$$

and write  $\overline{b_i}$  for the residue class of  $b_i$  in  $N_n$ . To compute the first syzygy  $\Omega^1(N_n)$  of  $N_n$ , consider the projective cover  $\pi : \bigoplus_{i=1}^n \Lambda b_i \rightarrow N_n$  with  $\pi(b_i) = \overline{b_i}$ , and set  $C_i = \Lambda(pb_i - qb_{i+1})$  for  $1 \leq i \leq n-1$ . Note that  $C_i \simeq \Lambda(p, q)$ , whence  $\text{p dim } C_i < \infty$  by condition (i). We will conclude that  $\text{p dim } N_n < \infty$  by showing that  $\ker \pi = \bigoplus_{i=1}^{n-1} C_i$ . Suppose that

$$0 = \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \lambda_i (pb_i - qb_{i+1}) = \lambda_1 pb_1 + (\lambda_2 p - \lambda_1 q)b_2 + \cdots + (\lambda_{n-1} p - \lambda_{n-2} q)b_{n-1} - \lambda_{n-1} qb_n$$

for certain coefficients  $\lambda_i \in \Lambda$ . This implies that  $\lambda_1 p = 0$ ,  $\lambda_{n-1} q = 0$  and  $\lambda_i p - \lambda_{i-1} q = 0$  for  $2 \leq i \leq n-1$ , and in view of the hypothesis that  $\Lambda p \cap \Lambda q = 0$ , the latter equations entail  $\lambda_i p = \lambda_{i-1} q = 0$ . Thus we obtain  $\lambda_i (pb_i - qb_{i+1}) = 0$  for  $1 \leq i \leq n-1$  as required.

Case I. Suppose that, in addition, condition (ii) holds, but that there nonetheless exists a right  $\mathcal{P}^\infty(\Lambda\text{-mod})$ -approximation  $\varphi : A \rightarrow S_1$  for  $S_1$ . Pick  $n > \text{length}(A)$ , define  $f : N_n \rightarrow S_1$  via  $f(\overline{b_1}) = e_1 + J e_1$ ,  $f(\overline{b_i}) = 0$  for  $i \geq 2$ , and let  $g \in \text{Hom}_\Lambda(N_n, A)$  be such that  $f = \varphi g$ , i.e., such that the following diagram commutes:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} & N_n & \\ g \swarrow & \downarrow f & \\ A & \xrightarrow{\varphi} & S_1 \end{array}$$

Next pick  $m \geq 1$  minimal with the property that  $g(\bar{b}_1), \dots, g(\bar{b}_m)$  are  $K$ -linearly dependent modulo  $JA$ ; such an integer  $m$  exists because  $\text{length}(N_n/JN_n) = n > \text{length}(A)$ . Say  $\sum_{i=1}^m k_i g(\bar{b}_i) \in JA$  with  $k_i \in K$ , not all zero. Clearly,  $k_m \neq 0$ . Moreover,  $k_1 = 0$ , since  $0 = f(\sum_{i=2}^m k_i \bar{b}_i) = \varphi g(\sum_{i=2}^m k_i \bar{b}_i) = -k_1 \varphi g(\bar{b}_1) = -k_1(e_1 + Je_1)$ . In particular, this shows that  $m \geq 2$ . Now set  $x = \sum_{i=2}^m k_i \bar{b}_{i-1}$ . We will check that  $g(x) = \sum_{i=1}^{m-1} k_{i+1} g(\bar{b}_i)$  again belongs to  $JA$ , a contradiction to the minimal choice of  $m$ . Indeed,  $pg(x) = g(\sum_{i=2}^m k_i p\bar{b}_{i-1}) = g(\sum_{i=2}^m k_i q\bar{b}_i) = qg(\sum_{i=2}^m k_i \bar{b}_i) \in qJA$ , which by condition (ii) entails that  $g(x)$  is not a top element of  $A$ . This shows  $g(x) \in JA$  and thus completes the argument for Case I.

Case II. Now suppose that conditions (i) and (ii') hold. Again assume that  $S_1$  has a right  $\mathcal{P}^\infty(\Lambda\text{-mod})$ -approximation  $\varphi : A \rightarrow S_1$ , and for  $n > \text{length}(A)$ , define  $f : N_n \rightarrow S_1$  as in case I. In turn choose  $g \in \text{Hom}_\Lambda(N_n, A)$  such that  $f = \varphi g$ . But this time, pick  $m \in \mathbb{N}$  minimal with the property that  $\sum_{i=1}^m k_i g(\bar{b}_i) \in JA$  and  $q(\sum_{i=1}^m k_i g(\bar{b}_i)) = 0$ , for some scalars  $k_i \in K$  which are not all zero. Such an  $m$  exists because  $\ker(g)$  intersects the  $K$ -subspace of  $N_n$  generated by  $\bar{b}_1, \dots, \bar{b}_n$  non-trivially. As before we obtain  $k_1 = 0$  and  $m \geq 2$ , and again, we set  $x = \sum_{i=2}^m k_i \bar{b}_{i-1}$  and compute  $pg(x) = q(\sum_{i=2}^m k_i g(\bar{b}_i)) = 0$ . Now condition (ii') guarantees that  $g(x) = \sum_{i=1}^{m-1} k_{i+1} g(\bar{b}_i)$  is not a top element of  $A$  and that  $qg(x) = q(\sum_{i=1}^{m-1} k_{i+1} g(\bar{b}_i)) = 0$ . This is, once more, incompatible with the minimal choice of  $m$ .  $\square$

**Example 2.** [9] Let  $\Lambda = K\Gamma/I$  be the monomial relation algebra with quiver

$$\Gamma : \quad \begin{array}{ccc} & \alpha & \\ & \curvearrowright & \\ 1 & \xrightarrow{\beta} & 2 \\ & \curvearrowleft & \\ & \gamma & \end{array}$$

and ideal  $I = \langle \alpha\gamma, \beta\gamma, \gamma\beta \rangle$  of relations. Then the indecomposable projective left  $\Lambda$ -modules have the following graphs:

$$\begin{array}{cc} & 1 \\ & \swarrow \alpha \quad \searrow \beta \\ 2 & \quad 2 \\ \gamma \downarrow & \\ 1 & \end{array} \quad \begin{array}{c} 2 \\ \gamma \downarrow \\ 1 \end{array}$$

Set  $p = \beta$  and  $q = \alpha$ , and verify the simplified versions of conditions (i) and (ii), as spelled out before the proof of Criterion 1: Clearly,  $\alpha J = J\beta = 0$  and  $\text{p dim } \Lambda\alpha = 0 < \infty$ , while  $\text{p dim } \Lambda e_2/J e_2 = \infty$ . Thus the criterion guarantees that  $S_1$  does not have a right  $\mathcal{P}^\infty(\Lambda\text{-mod})$ -approximation.  $\square$

Note that a typical class of modules defeating attempts to find a right  $\mathcal{P}^\infty(\Lambda\text{-mod})$ -approximation of  $S_1$  in Example 2 is the following class  $(M_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  of strings of composition length  $2n$ , uniquely determined by their graphs:

$$M_n : \begin{array}{c} 1 & & 1 & & & & 1 \\ & \searrow \beta & \nearrow \alpha & \searrow \beta & \dots & \nearrow \alpha & \searrow \beta \\ & 2 & & 2 & & 2 & 2 \end{array}$$

(Observe that this family of modules  $M_n$  represents just a minor simplification of the family of test modules  $N_n$  exhibited in the proof of Criterion 1 for the choices  $p = \beta$  and  $q = \alpha$ ; namely  $M_n \cong N_n / \Lambda \alpha \overline{b_1}$ .) A stumbling block for contravariant finiteness can be more succinctly communicated via the infinite dimensional direct limit of the strings  $M_n$ :

$$\varinjlim M_n : \begin{array}{c} 1 & & 1 & & 1 & & \dots \\ & \searrow \beta & \nearrow \alpha & \searrow \beta & \nearrow \alpha & \searrow \beta & \dots \\ & 2 & & 2 & & 2 & \dots \end{array}$$


At the same time, this limit is a ‘minimal’ module  $M \in \mathcal{P}^\infty(\Lambda\text{-Mod})$  with the property that all homomorphisms  $M_n \rightarrow S_1$ ,  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , factor through  $M$ .

By the preceding example one could be led to believe that – under the assumption that  $\Lambda\beta$  is a direct summand of  $Je_1$  having infinite projective dimension – the existence of a family of modules  $(M_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  as above should imply non-existence of a  $\mathcal{P}^\infty$ -approximation of the simple module associated with the vertex ‘1’. This is not the case, however. In fact, the existence of modules  $(M_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  of the indicated shape inside  $\mathcal{P}^\infty(\Lambda\text{-mod})$  is only potentially troublesome. Continuing to denote the algebra of Example 2 by  $\Lambda$ , we next give an example of an algebra  $\Delta$  with  $\Lambda\text{-mod} \subseteq \Delta\text{-mod}$  such that  $\Delta e_i = \Lambda e_i$  for  $i = 1, 2$  and  $(\Lambda\text{-mod}) \cap \mathcal{P}^\infty(\Delta\text{-mod}) = \mathcal{P}^\infty(\Lambda\text{-mod})$ ; in particular, all of the  $\Lambda$ -modules  $M_n$  belong also to  $\mathcal{P}^\infty(\Delta\text{-mod})$ . On the other hand, we will see that  $\mathcal{P}^\infty(\Delta\text{-mod})$  is contravariantly finite in  $\Delta\text{-mod}$  in this example.

**Example 3.** Let  $\Delta = K\Gamma'/I'$ , where  $\Gamma'$  is

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} & & \alpha & & \\ & & \curvearrowright & & \\ 3 & \xrightarrow{\delta} & 1 & \xrightleftharpoons[\gamma]{\beta} & 2 \end{array}$$

and the ideal  $I'$  is generated by monomial relations such that the indecomposable projective left  $\Delta$ -modules have graphs



This time the ‘zipper effect’ of the previous example (where the requirement that the homomorphisms  $f \in \text{Hom}_\Lambda(M_n, S)$  be factorizable through a module  $M \in \mathcal{P}^\infty(\Lambda\text{-mod})$  forces the  $K$ -dimension of  $M$  to grow with increasing  $n$ ) can be stopped. This is due to the new projective module  $\Lambda e_3$ .

We will prove the contravariant finiteness of  $\mathcal{P}^\infty(\Delta\text{-mod})$  by explicitly describing minimal  $\mathcal{P}^\infty(\Delta\text{-mod})$ -approximations of the simple left  $\Delta$ -modules. We claim that the following canonical epimorphism is a right  $\mathcal{P}^\infty(\Delta\text{-mod})$ -approximation of  $S_1$ :

$$\varphi_1 : A_1 = \begin{array}{c} 1 \quad 3 \\ \beta \searrow \quad \uparrow \delta \\ \quad 1 \\ \alpha \nearrow \\ 2 \end{array} \longrightarrow S_1$$

Note that  $A_1 = (\Delta e_1 \oplus \Delta e_3) / (\Delta \alpha e_1 + \Delta(\beta e_1 - \alpha \delta e_3))$  is the injective envelope of the simple module  $S_2 = \Delta e_2 / J e_2$ . We again use  $J$  to denote the Jacobson radical of  $\Delta$ . and if  $x_1$  and  $x_3$  stand for the residue classes of  $e_1$  and  $e_3$  in  $A_1$ , respectively, we let  $\varphi_1(x_1) = e_1 + J e_1$  and  $\varphi_1(x_3) = 0$ .

Note first that  $\Omega^1(A_1) = (\Delta e_2)^2$ , whence  $\text{pdim } A_1 = 1$ . Now let  $f : M \rightarrow S_1$  be an epimorphism with  $M \in \mathcal{P}^\infty(\Delta\text{-mod})$ ,  $m_1 \in M$  a top element of type  $e_1$  such that  $f(m_1) = e_1 + J e_1$ , and let  $m_2, \dots, m_r \in \ker(f)$  be such that  $m_1 + JM, \dots, m_r + JM$  form a  $K$ -basis for  $e_1(M/JM)$ . Then each  $\beta m_i$  is a nonzero element in the socle of  $M$ , since otherwise  $\Omega^1(M)$  would contain a direct summand isomorphic to  $S_2$ , which is impossible in view of the fact that  $\text{pdim } S_2 = \infty$ , while  $\text{pdim } M < \infty$ . More strongly, this argument shows that  $\beta m_1, \dots, \beta m_r$  are  $K$ -linearly independent, whence in particular  $\beta \overline{m}_1$  remains nonzero in  $\overline{M} = M / \left( \sum_{i=2}^r \Delta \beta m_i \right)$ . It is enough to factor the map  $\overline{f} : \overline{M} \rightarrow S_1$  induced by  $f$  through  $\varphi_1$ . In doing this, it is clearly harmless to assume that  $\alpha \overline{m}_1 = k \beta \overline{m}_1$  for some scalar  $k \in K$  which may be zero; if this is not a priori the case, we factor out the submodule  $\Delta(\alpha - \beta) \overline{m}_1$  in addition. Furthermore, we may assume that the elements



$m_2, \dots, m_r \in \ker(f)$  are chosen in such a way that there exists an integer  $s$  between 2 and  $r$  with the property that  $\beta \overline{m}_1 = \alpha \overline{m}_i$  for  $2 \leq i \leq s$  and  $\Delta \beta \overline{m}_1 \cap (\sum_{i=s+1}^r \Delta \alpha \overline{m}_i) = 0$ .

Set  $B = \sum_{i=1}^r \Delta \overline{m}_i$ , and let  $\iota : B \rightarrow \overline{M}$  be the canonical embedding. In view of the preceding adjustments, we can define a map  $\sigma \in \text{Hom}_\Delta(B, A_1)$  by setting  $\sigma(\overline{m}_1) = x_1 + k\delta x_3$ ,  $\sigma(\overline{m}_i) = \delta x_3$  for  $2 \leq i \leq s$ , and  $\sigma(\overline{m}_i) = 0$  for  $s+1 \leq i \leq r$ . Since  $A_1$  is injective,  $\sigma$  can be extended to a homomorphism  $\tau \in \text{Hom}_\Delta(\overline{M}, A_1)$  which makes the lower triangle in the diagram below commute.

$$\begin{array}{ccc} A_1 & \xrightarrow{\varphi_1} & S_1 \\ \sigma \uparrow & \nwarrow \tau & \uparrow \overline{f} \\ B & \xrightarrow{\iota} & \overline{M} \end{array}$$

Our construction entails that the upper triangle then commutes as well, which shows that  $\varphi_1$  is indeed a (minimal)  $\mathcal{P}^\infty(\Delta\text{-mod})$ -approximation of  $S_1$ .

It is less involved to see that the canonical maps


$$\varphi_2 : \begin{array}{c} 2 \\ \gamma \downarrow \\ 1 \end{array} \longrightarrow S_2 \quad \text{and} \quad \varphi_3 : \begin{array}{c} 3 \\ \delta \downarrow \\ 1 \end{array} \longrightarrow S_3$$

are right  $\mathcal{P}^\infty(\Delta\text{-mod})$ -approximations of  $S_2$  and  $S_3$ , respectively. By [2], this shows that  $\mathcal{P}^\infty(\Delta\text{-mod})$  is contravariantly finite in  $\Delta\text{-mod}$ .  $\square$

Example 3 also shows that the hypotheses of Criterion 1 cannot be simplified to the combination of conditions (i) and (iii), where (iii) is as in the remark following the statement of the criterion. Indeed, if in Example 3, we take  $p = \beta$  and  $q = \alpha$ , then both (i) and (iii) are satisfied, but  $S_1$  does admit a right  $\mathcal{P}^\infty$ -approximation.

Finally, we modify the algebra  $\Delta$  of Example 3 very slightly to an algebra  $\Xi$ , with the effect that  $\mathcal{P}^\infty(\Xi\text{-mod})$  again fails to be contravariantly finite. Here condition (ii) fails for any choice of  $p$  and  $q$ , but (i) and (ii') are satisfied. This sequence of modifications illustrates a phenomenon which will become more obvious in the sequel: Namely, that contravariant finiteness of  $\mathcal{P}^\infty(\Lambda\text{-mod})$  in  $\Lambda\text{-mod}$  – as well as failure of this condition – is highly unstable.

**Example 4.** The quiver of  $\Xi$  is that of the algebra  $\Delta$  in Example 3, but we delete one of the relations, with the effect that the  $K$ -dimension of  $\Xi$  exceeds that of  $\Delta$  by 1, and the indecomposable projective left  $\Xi$ -modules take on the form




We again apply Criterion 1 with the choice  $p = \beta$  and  $q = \alpha$ . Clearly,  $\Lambda\alpha \cap \Lambda\beta = 0$ . Moreover,  $\text{pdim } \Xi(\beta, \alpha) = \text{pdim} \begin{pmatrix} 2 \\ 1 \mid \gamma \\ 1 \end{pmatrix} = 0$ , whence condition (i) of the criterion is satisfied.

Next, we check that condition (ii') of our criterion is satisfied. Let  $M$  be in  $\mathcal{P}^\infty(\Xi\text{-mod})$ . As in Example 3, it is readily checked that, given any top element  $x \in M$  of type  $e_1$ , we have  $\beta x \neq 0$ . So, in proving that for an *arbitrary* element  $x \in M$ , the vanishing of  $\beta x$  implies the vanishing of  $\alpha x$ , we may assume that  $x = e_1 x \in JM$  with  $\beta x = 0$ ; since  $\beta J = K\beta\delta$  and  $\alpha J = K\alpha\delta$ , we may moreover assume that  $x \in \delta M$ . Suppose that  $\alpha x \neq 0$ . In view of the equality  $\alpha\delta J = 0$ , this implies that  $x \in \delta M \setminus \delta JM$ , i.e.,  $x = \delta y$  for some top element  $y \in M$  of type  $e_3$ . Let  $\pi : P = \Xi e_3 \oplus Q \rightarrow M$  be a projective cover with  $\pi(e_3) = y$ . Then  $\beta\delta e_3$  is a nonzero element of  $\ker \pi = \Omega^1(M)$ , and since  $\Xi\beta\delta e_3 \simeq S_2$  has infinite projective dimension and is thus not a direct summand of  $\Omega^1(M)$ , we see that  $\beta\delta e_3 \in J\Omega^1(M) \cap \beta JP = \beta\Omega^1(M)$ ; the last equality follows from [5, Lemma 1]. Thus  $\beta\delta e_3 = \beta z$ , where  $z = e_1 z \in e_1\Omega^1(M)e_3 \subseteq e_1 J P e_3$ . Since, clearly, the desired implication ' $\beta u = 0 \implies \alpha u = 0$ ' does hold for arbitrary elements  $u$  of a projective left  $\Xi$ -module, we deduce that  $\alpha\delta e_3 = \alpha z$  and conclude that  $\alpha x = \alpha\pi(z) = 0$  as required.

Finally, we note that condition (ii) fails in this example. Indeed, if it would hold, it would be true for  $p = \beta$  and  $q = \alpha$ . However, the left  $\Xi$ -module

$$M = (\Xi e_1 \oplus \Xi e_3) / (\Xi \alpha e_1 + \Xi(\beta e_1 - \alpha \delta e_3))$$

with graph



has syzygy  $\Omega^1(M) = \begin{smallmatrix} 2 \\ 1 \end{smallmatrix} \gamma \oplus \begin{smallmatrix} 2 \\ 1 \end{smallmatrix} \gamma$ , and thus  $\text{p dim } M = 1$ , but if  $x_i$  is the residue class of  $e_i$  in  $M$  for  $i = 1, 3$ , then  $x_1$  is a top element of type  $e_1$  with  $\beta x_1 = \alpha \delta x_3 \in \alpha JM$ .  $\square$

As in Example 2, we can again – in the preceding example – pin down classes of modules of finite projective dimension which are responsible for failure of contravariant finiteness of  $\mathcal{P}^\infty(\Xi\text{-mod})$ . For instance, there is no homomorphism  $\varphi : A \rightarrow S_1$  with  $A \in \mathcal{P}^\infty(\Xi\text{-mod})$  such that *all* the canonical epimorphisms from the modules

$$E_n : \quad \begin{array}{ccccccc} & 1 & & 3 & & 3 & & 3 \\ & \beta \swarrow & & \delta \downarrow & & \delta \downarrow & & \delta \downarrow \\ & & 1 & & 1 & & \cdots & 1 \\ & \alpha \swarrow & \searrow \beta & & \alpha \swarrow & \searrow \beta & & \alpha \swarrow & \searrow \beta \\ 2 & & 2 & & 2 & & & 2 & & 2 \end{array}$$

onto  $S_1$  can be factored through  $\varphi$ . Observe, however, that they can all be factored through the canonical surjection from

$$E = \varinjlim E_n : \quad \begin{array}{ccccccc} & 1 & & 3 & & 3 & & 3 \\ & \beta \swarrow & & \delta \downarrow & & \delta \downarrow & & \delta \downarrow \\ & & 1 & & 1 & & \cdots & 1 \\ & \alpha \swarrow & \searrow \beta & & \alpha \swarrow & \searrow \beta & & \alpha \swarrow & \searrow \beta \\ 2 & & 2 & & 2 & & & 2 & & 2 \end{array}$$

onto  $S_1$ .

### 3. RELATIVE APPROXIMATIONS AND PHANTOMS

If  $\mathfrak{A} \subset \Lambda\text{-mod}$  is a resolving contravariantly finite subcategory of  $\Lambda\text{-mod}$ , then, according to [2], the minimal right approximations of the simple left  $\Lambda$ -modules hold a substantial amount of information on arbitrary objects of  $\mathfrak{A}$ . The gap in the available information when  $\mathfrak{A}$  is not contravariantly finite is to be filled by direct limits of ‘partial approximations’ as indicated informally in Section 2. (We follow the convention that ‘direct limits’ are colimits extending over directed index sets.)

**Definitions 5.** Let  $\mathfrak{C} \subset \mathfrak{A}$  be full subcategories of  $\Lambda\text{-mod}$  such that  $\mathfrak{A}$  is closed under finite direct sums, and let  $\widehat{\mathfrak{A}}$  be the closure of  $\mathfrak{A}$  under direct limits in  $\Lambda\text{-Mod}$ . Moreover, let  $X$  be a finitely generated left  $\Lambda$ -module.

(1) A (right)  $\mathfrak{C}$ -approximation of  $X$  inside  $\mathfrak{A}$  (resp. inside  $\widehat{\mathfrak{A}}$ ) is a homomorphism  $f : A \rightarrow X$  with  $A$  in  $\mathfrak{A}$  (resp.  $A$  in  $\widehat{\mathfrak{A}}$ ) such that

$$\mathrm{Hom}(-, A)|_{\mathfrak{C}} \xrightarrow{\mathrm{Hom}(-, f)} \mathrm{Hom}(-, X)|_{\mathfrak{C}} \rightarrow 0$$

is an exact sequence of functors, i.e., such that each map  $g \in \mathrm{Hom}_{\Lambda}(C, X)$  with  $C$  in  $\mathfrak{C}$  factors through  $f$ .

If  $\mathfrak{C} = \mathfrak{A}$ , a  $\mathfrak{C}$ -approximation of  $X$  inside  $\mathfrak{A}$  will simply be called a (right)  $\mathfrak{A}$ -approximation of  $X$ , in accordance with the existing terminology.

(2) A  $\mathfrak{C}$ -phantom of  $X$  relative to  $\mathfrak{A}$  of the first kind is an object  $B$  in  $\Lambda\text{-mod}$  (not necessarily in  $\mathfrak{A}$ ) with the following property: There exists a finite non-empty set  $\mathfrak{C}(B) \subset \mathfrak{C}$  such that, for each  $\mathfrak{C}(B)$ -approximation  $f : A \rightarrow X$  inside  $\mathfrak{A}$ , the module  $B$  is a subfactor of  $A$ . Any direct limit of  $\mathfrak{C}$ -phantoms of  $X$  of the first kind will be called a  $\mathfrak{C}$ -phantom of  $X$  of the second kind.

We will refer to both kinds of phantoms as  $\mathfrak{C}$ -phantoms of  $X$  relative to  $\mathfrak{A}$  and, more briefly, to  $\mathfrak{A}$ -phantoms if  $\mathfrak{C} = \mathfrak{A}$ .

(3) A  $\mathfrak{C}$ -phantom  $B$  of  $X$  relative to  $\mathfrak{A}$  is called *effective* if there exists a homomorphism  $f : B \rightarrow X$  which is a  $\mathfrak{C}$ -approximation of  $X$  inside  $\widehat{\mathfrak{A}}$  (in particular,  $B \in \widehat{\mathfrak{A}}$  in that case).

In case  $X$  fails to have an  $\mathfrak{A}$ -approximation, there may be a plethora of  $\mathfrak{A}$ -phantoms. This facilitates the construction of infinite dimensional phantoms, which in turn lie at the heart of our criteria for failure of contravariant finiteness of  $\mathfrak{A}$ .

The *effective* phantoms, on the other hand, are in a sense the best possible substitutes for minimal approximations in the sense of Auslander/Smalø [3] and Auslander/Reiten [2]. For example, if  $X = \Lambda e / J e$  is simple, the effective  $\mathfrak{A}$ -phantoms of  $X$  compress information about the relations of those modules in  $\mathfrak{A}$  which have a top element of type  $e$  into the tightest possible format. Compared with classical approximations, we simply renounce the requirement that this picture should fit into a finitely generated module.

Our primary interest here will be in the situation where  $\mathfrak{A} = \mathcal{P}^{\infty}(\Lambda\text{-mod})$  and  $\mathfrak{C}$  is a countable family of modules of finite projective dimension.

**Basic Observations 6.** Let  $\mathfrak{C}, \mathfrak{A}, \widehat{\mathfrak{A}}$  and  $X$  be as in Definition 5.

(1) Since  $\widehat{\mathfrak{A}}$  is closed under arbitrary direct sums, it is clear that  $X$  always has  $\mathfrak{C}$ -approximations inside  $\widehat{\mathfrak{A}}$ . Just add up a sufficient number of copies of each object  $C$  in  $\mathfrak{C}$  to cover all homomorphisms  $C \rightarrow X$ . Similarly,  $X$  has a  $\mathfrak{C}$ -approximation inside  $\mathfrak{A}$  whenever  $\mathfrak{C} \subseteq \mathfrak{A}$  is a finite subset, because  $\mathrm{Hom}_{\Lambda}(C, X)$  has finite  $K$ -dimension for each  $C \in \mathfrak{C}$ .

(2) If  $X$  has phantoms relative to  $\mathfrak{A}$  which have unbounded finite lengths, then  $X$  fails to have an  $\mathfrak{A}$ -approximation. In particular, this is true in case  $X$  has a non-finitely generated  $\mathfrak{A}$ -phantom.

(3) Suppose that, in addition to being closed under finite direct sums,  $\mathfrak{A}$  is closed under direct summands. Then the existence of an  $\mathfrak{A}$ -approximation of  $X$  implies the existence of a *unique* minimal such approximation by [2], say  $A(X)$ . In that case,  $A(X)$  is the only effective  $\mathfrak{A}$ -phantom of  $X$ , and all other  $\mathfrak{A}$ -phantoms of  $X$  are subfactors of  $A(X)$ .

(4) If  $\mathfrak{C} \subseteq \mathfrak{C}' \subseteq \mathfrak{A}$ , each  $\mathfrak{C}$ -phantom relative to  $\mathfrak{A}$  is also a  $\mathfrak{C}'$ -phantom relative to  $\mathfrak{A}$ . So, in particular, each  $\mathfrak{C}$ -phantom relative to  $\mathfrak{A}$  is an  $\mathfrak{A}$ -phantom.  $\square$

**7. The Examples of Section 2 Revisited.** Let  $X = S_1 = \Lambda e_1 / J e_1$ , and  $\mathfrak{A} = \mathcal{P}^\infty(\Lambda\text{-mod})$ .

In Example 2, the module

$$M = \varinjlim M_n : \quad \begin{array}{ccccccc} & 1 & & 1 & & 1 & \\ & \beta \swarrow & & \alpha \swarrow & & \beta \swarrow & \\ & & 2 & & 2 & & 2 \end{array} \quad \dots$$

is an effective  $\mathfrak{C}$ -phantom of  $S_1$  inside  $\mathcal{P}^\infty(\Lambda\text{-Mod})$ , where  $\mathfrak{C} = \{M_n \mid n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ , but

$$N : \quad \begin{array}{ccccccc} & 1 & & 1 & & 1 & \\ & \alpha \swarrow & & \beta \swarrow & & \alpha \swarrow & \\ & & 2 & & 2 & & 2 \\ & \gamma \downarrow & & & & & \\ & 1 & & & & & \end{array} \quad \dots$$

is neither the source of a  $\mathfrak{C}$ -approximation of  $S_1$  inside  $\mathcal{P}^\infty(\Lambda\text{-Mod})$ , nor a  $\mathfrak{C}$ -phantom of  $S_1$  relative to  $\mathcal{P}^\infty(\Lambda\text{-mod})$ .

As for Example 3: Start by observing that the above graphs uniquely define left modules over the modified algebra  $\Delta$ , again denoted  $M_n, M$  and  $N$ , and the class of  $\Delta$ -modules  $\mathfrak{C} = \{M_n \mid n \in \mathbb{N}\}$  in turn belongs to  $\mathcal{P}^\infty(\Delta\text{-mod})$ . Moreover, the homomorphism  $f : M \rightarrow S_1 = \Delta e_1 / J e_1$  which sends the top element represented by the left-most ‘1’ in the graph of  $M$  to  $e_1 + J e_1$  and sends the top elements displayed farther to the right to zero is still a  $\mathfrak{C}$ -approximation of  $S_1$  inside  $\mathcal{P}^\infty(\Delta\text{-mod})$ . However, in the present setup, both  $M$  and  $N$  fail to be  $\mathfrak{C}$ -phantoms of  $S_1$  relative to  $\mathcal{P}^\infty(\Delta\text{-mod})$ ; indeed, as we saw earlier,  $S_1$  has a  $\mathcal{P}^\infty(\Delta\text{-mod})$ -approximation in that example.

Finally, let us focus on Example 4. Viewing  $M_n$  and  $M$  as left  $\Xi$ -modules, and keeping in mind that the  $M_n$  belong to  $\mathcal{P}^\infty(\Xi\text{-mod})$ , we find that  $M$  is an effective  $\mathfrak{C}$ -phantom of  $S_1$  relative to  $\mathcal{P}^\infty(\Xi\text{-mod})$ , as in Example 2. Moreover, if  $\mathfrak{C} = \{E_n \mid n \in \mathbb{N}\}$  with  $E_n$  as defined after Example 4, then  $M$  is also an  $\mathfrak{C}$ -phantom of  $S_1$  relative to  $\mathcal{P}^\infty(\Xi\text{-mod})$ , but not an effective one because the canonical epimorphism

$$\begin{array}{c}
 \begin{array}{ccc}
 & 1 & 3 \\
 & \beta \swarrow & \delta \downarrow \\
 E_2 = & & 1 \\
 & \searrow \alpha & \\
 & 2 & 
 \end{array}
 \longrightarrow S_1
 \end{array}$$

does not factor through  $M$ . The better  $\mathfrak{E}$ -phantom here is  $E = \varinjlim E_n$ , which is actually an effective  $(\mathfrak{C} \cup \mathfrak{E})$ -phantom of  $S_1$  relative to  $\mathcal{P}^\infty(\Xi\text{-mod})$ .  $\square$

Next we prepare for a general existence result. In a nutshell: Whenever  $\mathfrak{A} \subseteq \Lambda\text{-mod}$  fails to be contravariantly finite, there exist  $\mathfrak{A}$ -phantoms of infinite  $K$ -dimension.

**Proposition 8.** *Suppose that  $\mathfrak{A} \subseteq \Lambda\text{-mod}$  is closed under finite direct sums and that  $X \in \Lambda\text{-mod}$  does not have a (right)  $\mathfrak{A}$ -approximation. Then there exists a countable subclass  $\mathfrak{C}$  of  $\mathfrak{A}$  such that  $X$  fails to have a  $\mathfrak{C}$ -approximation inside  $\mathfrak{A}$ .*

*Proof.* By repeatedly applying the first of the observations under 6, we show that, for each  $d \geq 1$ , there exists a finite subset  $\mathfrak{C}_d$  of  $\mathfrak{A}$  such that  $X$  does not have a  $\mathfrak{C}_d$ -approximation of  $K$ -dimension  $\leq d$  inside  $\mathfrak{A}$ .

Assuming the contrary for some  $d \geq 1$ , we pick a module  $Y_1$  in  $\mathfrak{A}$  with  $\text{Hom}_\Lambda(Y_1, X) \neq 0$  – such a module  $Y_1$  exists by hypothesis – and let  $f_1 : A_1 \rightarrow X$  be a  $\{Y_1\}$ -approximation of  $X$  inside  $\mathfrak{A}$  such that  $\dim_k A_1 \leq d$ . In particular,  $f_1$  is nonzero. Since  $X$  fails to have an  $\mathfrak{A}$ -approximation, there exists an object  $Y_2$  in  $\mathfrak{A}$  such that some homomorphism in  $\text{Hom}_\Lambda(Y_2, X)$  fails to factor through  $f_1$ . Let  $f_2 : A_2 \rightarrow X$  be an  $\{A_1, Y_2\}$ -approximation of  $X$  inside  $\mathfrak{A}$ ; by assumption,  $A_2$  can be chosen to have  $K$ -dimension at most  $d$ . Inductively, our assumption thus yields a family  $(A_n)_{n \geq 1}$  of objects of  $\mathfrak{A}$  with  $\dim_k A_n \leq d$  for all  $n$ , together with finitely generated left  $\Lambda$ -modules  $Y_n$  and homomorphisms  $f_n : A_n \rightarrow X$  such that  $f_n$  is an  $\{A_{n-1}, Y_n\}$ -approximation of  $X$  inside  $\mathfrak{A}$ , but fails to be a  $\{Y_{n+1}\}$ -approximation. Accordingly, we can pick  $g_n \in \text{Hom}_\Lambda(A_n, A_{n+1})$  such that  $f_n = f_{n+1}g_n$  and none of the  $g_n$  is an isomorphism. But since  $f_1 = f_2g_1 = f_3g_2g_1 = \cdots = f_{n+1}g_n \cdots g_1$  is nonzero, we deduce  $g_n \cdots g_1 \neq 0$  for all  $n$ , which contradicts the Harada-Sai Lemma [6] and proves our assumption to be absurd.

Letting  $\mathfrak{C}_d$  for  $d \geq 1$  be as in our initial claim, the countable subset  $\mathfrak{C} = \bigcup_{d \geq 1} \mathfrak{C}_d$  of  $\mathfrak{A}$  is clearly as desired.  $\square$

We apply this proposition to obtain the announced existence result.

**Theorem 9.** *Suppose that  $\mathfrak{A} \subseteq \Lambda\text{-mod}$  is closed under finite direct sums, and let  $X \in \Lambda\text{-mod}$ . Then the following conditions are equivalent:*

- (1)  *$X$  fails to have an  $\mathfrak{A}$ -approximation.*
- (2) *There exists a countable subclass  $\mathfrak{C} \subseteq \mathfrak{A}$  such that  $X$  has an effective  $\mathfrak{C}$ -phantom of countably infinite  $K$ -dimension relative to  $\mathfrak{A}$ .*
- (3)  *$X$  has an  $\mathfrak{A}$ -phantom of infinite  $K$ -dimension.*

*Proof.* ‘(1)  $\implies$  (2)’. Assume that (1) holds. Then Proposition 8 yields a countable subclass  $\mathfrak{D} = \{D_1, D_2, D_3, \dots\}$  of  $\mathfrak{A}$  such that  $X$  does not have a  $\mathfrak{D}$ -approximation inside  $\mathfrak{A}$ . However, by the first of the observations under 6, there exists a  $\{D_1\}$ -approximation of  $X$  inside  $\mathfrak{A}$ , say  $f_1 : A_1 \rightarrow X$ .

Next we pick an  $\{A_1\}$ -approximation  $f_2 : A_2 \rightarrow X$  of  $X$  inside  $\mathfrak{A}$ , together with a map  $g_{1,2} \in \text{Hom}_\Lambda(A_1, A_2)$  satisfying  $f_1 = f_2 \circ g_{1,2}$ , such that  $\dim_K(g_{1,2}(A_1))$  is as small as possible. Consequently, the following is true: Whenever  $f'_2 : A'_2 \rightarrow X$  is an  $\{A_2\}$ -approximation of  $X$  inside  $\mathfrak{A}$  and  $g' \in \text{Hom}_\Lambda(A_2, A'_2)$  is such that  $f_2 = f'_2 \circ g'$ , we have  $g'(g_{1,2}(A_1)) \simeq g_{1,2}(A_1)$ .

We now choose any  $\{D_2, A_2\}$ -approximation  $f_3 : A_3 \rightarrow X$  of  $X$  inside  $\mathfrak{A}$ , and subsequently an  $\{A_3\}$ -approximation  $f_4 : A_4 \rightarrow X$  inside  $\mathfrak{A}$ , together with a map  $g_{3,4} \in \text{Hom}_\Lambda(A_3, A_4)$  such that  $f_3 = f_4 \circ g_{3,4}$  and  $\dim_K(g_{3,4}(A_3))$  is minimal.

Continuing along this line, we obtain a sequence of objects  $(A_n)_{n \geq 1}$  and maps  $f_n : A_n \rightarrow X$  such that, for  $n \geq 2$ ,  $f_{2n-1}$  is a  $\{D_n, A_{2n-2}\}$ -approximation of  $X$  inside  $\mathfrak{A}$  and  $f_{2n}$  is an  $\{A_{2n-1}\}$ -approximation which is coupled with a map  $g_{2n-1,2n} \in \text{Hom}_\Lambda(A_{2n-1}, A_{2n})$  such that  $f_{2n-1} = f_{2n} \circ g_{2n-1,2n}$  and  $\dim_K(g_{2n-1,2n}(A_{2n-1}))$  is minimal.

Set  $\mathfrak{C} = \{A_1, A_2, A_3, \dots\}$  and supplement the above maps  $g_{n,n+1}$  for odd  $n$  by homomorphisms  $g_{n,n+1} \in \text{Hom}_\Lambda(A_n, A_{n+1})$  with  $f_n = f_{n+1} \circ g_{n,n+1}$  for  $n$  even. If, for  $n < m$ , we moreover define  $g_{n,m} = g_{m-1,m} \circ \dots \circ g_{n,n+1} : A_n \rightarrow A_m$ , then  $(A_n, g_{n,m})_{n,m \in \mathbb{N}, n < m}$  is an inductive system with  $f_n = f_m \circ g_{n,m}$ . Set

$$A = \varinjlim A_n, \quad f = \varinjlim f_n \in \text{Hom}_\Lambda(A, X),$$

and let  $h_n : A_n \rightarrow A$  be the canonical maps. Clearly,  $A$  belongs to  $\widehat{\mathfrak{A}}$  (see Definition 5). Moreover, each homomorphism in  $\text{Hom}_\Lambda(C, X)$  with  $C \in \mathfrak{C}$  factors through  $f$  and, a fortiori, so does each homomorphism in  $\text{Hom}_\Lambda(D_n, X)$ . In other words,  $f : A \rightarrow X$  is a  $\mathfrak{C} \cup \mathfrak{D}$ -approximation of  $X$  inside  $\widehat{\mathfrak{A}}$ .

Next we want to identify  $A$  as a  $\mathfrak{C}$ -phantom of  $X$  relative to  $\mathfrak{A}$ . Our construction entails that, for  $m > 2n$ , we have  $g_{2n,m} \circ g_{2n-1,2n}(A_{2n-1}) \simeq g_{2n-1,2n}(A_{2n-1})$ , and consequently we have  $h_{2n}(U_{2n}) \simeq U_{2n}$  if we define  $U_{2n} = g_{2n-1,2n}(A_{2n-1})$ . Since  $A$  is the directed union of the submodules  $h_{2n}(U_{2n})$ ,  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , it suffices to show that each of the modules  $U_{2n}$  is a  $\mathfrak{C}$ -phantom of  $X$  relative to  $\mathfrak{A}$  of the first kind. For that purpose, consider the finite subset  $\mathfrak{C}(U_{2n}) = \{A_{2n}\}$  of  $\mathfrak{C}$ , and let  $f' : A' \rightarrow X$  be a  $\mathfrak{C}(U_{2n})$ -approximation of  $X$  inside  $\mathfrak{A}$ . If  $g' \in \text{Hom}_\Lambda(A_{2n}, A')$  is such that  $f_{2n} = f' \circ g'$ , our construction yields  $U_{2n} \simeq g'(U_{2n}) \subseteq A'$ , which shows that  $U_{2n}$  is indeed a  $\mathfrak{C}$ -phantom of  $X$  relative to  $\mathfrak{A}$  of the first kind. Consequently,  $A$  is a  $\mathfrak{C}$ -phantom of  $X$  relative to  $\mathfrak{A}$  of the second kind which, by the preceding paragraph, is even effective.

Finally, we note that  $\dim_K A \leq \aleph_0$  by construction. To prove the reverse inequality, we assume, to the contrary, that  $\dim_K A < \infty$ . But this means that  $f$  is a  $\mathfrak{D}$ -approximation of  $X$  inside  $\mathfrak{A}$ , which contradicts our choice of  $\mathfrak{D}$  and completes the proof of ‘(1)  $\implies$  (2)’.

The implications ‘(2)  $\implies$  (3)’ and ‘(3)  $\implies$  (1)’ are immediate consequences of the basic observations 6(4) and 6(2), respectively.  $\square$

The following is an upgraded version of the elementary Criterion 1 for non-existence of a  $\mathcal{P}^\infty(\Lambda\text{-mod})$ -approximation of a given simple module  $S$ . The idea underlying the proof is

the same, even though we impose no restrictions on the subcategory  $\mathfrak{A} \subseteq \Lambda\text{-mod}$  this time. In particular, this criterion again points to a countable subclass  $\mathfrak{C}$  of  $\mathfrak{A}$  which obstructs the approximability of  $S$  by a *finitely generated* module of finite projective dimension. In view of the proof of Theorem 9, it can hence be used towards the explicit construction of  $\mathfrak{A}$ -phantoms of  $S$ . While this criterion will be instrumental in resolving the problem of contravariant finiteness in our key example (Section 4), for complex non-monomial algebras, it may still be nontrivial to verify or refute Condition (2) below. We therefore add an illustration of how the underlying idea can still be used towards deciding questions of contravariant finiteness, even when the criterion is not readily applicable verbatim.

**Criterion 10.** *Suppose that  $\Lambda$  is a split finite dimensional algebra and  $\mathfrak{A}$  a full subcategory of  $\Lambda\text{-mod}$ . Moreover, let  $e_1, \dots, e_m$  be pairwise orthogonal primitive idempotents of  $\Lambda$ , and  $p_1, \dots, p_m, q_1, \dots, q_m \in J$  with  $p_i = p_i e_i$  and  $q_i = q_i e_i$  such that the following conditions are satisfied:*

(1) *For each  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , there is a module  $M_n \in \mathfrak{A}$ , together with a sequence  $x_{n1}, \dots, x_{n,mn}$  of  $mn$  top elements of  $M_n$  which are  $K$ -linearly independent modulo  $JM_n$  such that  $0 \neq p_{r(i)}x_{ni} = q_{r(i+1)}x_{n,i+1}$  for  $1 \leq i < mn$ , where  $r(i) \in \{1, \dots, m\}$  is congruent to  $i$  modulo  $m$ .*

(2) *For any object  $C$  in  $\mathfrak{A}$ , the following are true:*

(i) *if  $x \in C$  is a top element of type  $e_1$  then  $p_1 x \neq 0$ ;*

(ii) *if  $y, z \in C$  with  $0 \neq p_{r(i)}y = q_{r(i+1)}z$ , then  $p_{r(i+1)}z \neq 0$ .*


*Then  $S_1 = \Lambda e_1 / J e_1$  does not have an  $\{M_n \mid n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ -approximation inside  $\mathfrak{A}$ . In particular,  $\mathfrak{A}$  is not contravariantly finite in  $\Lambda\text{-mod}$  in that case.*

*Proof.* Assume to the contrary that  $f : A \rightarrow S_1$  is an  $\{M_n \mid n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ -approximation of  $S_1$ , and choose  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  such that  $\dim_K A < mn$ . Fixing  $n$ , we will briefly write  $x_i$  for  $x_{ni}$ ,  $1 \leq i \leq mn$ . Consider the homomorphism  $g : M_n \rightarrow S_1$ , defined by  $g(x_1) = e_1 + J e_1$  and  $g(x_i) = 0$  for  $2 \leq i \leq mn$ ; this definition is meaningful because  $x_1$  is a top element of  $M_n$  of type  $e_1$ . Choose  $h : M_n \rightarrow A$  such that  $g = fh$ . Moreover, note that, due to the linear dependence of the elements  $h(x_1), \dots, h(x_{mn})$  of  $A$ , there exists a natural number  $t$ , together with scalars  $k_t, \dots, k_n$  such that  $k_t \neq 0$  whereas  $0 = p_{r(t)} \sum_{i=t}^{mn} k_i h(x_i) = p_{r(t)} z$ , where  $z = \sum_{i=t}^{mn} h(e_{r(t)} k_i x_i)$ .

Choose  $t$  minimal with the property that the next-to-last equation is satisfied for some nonzero scalar  $k_t$  and some scalars  $k_{t+1}, \dots, k_{mn}$ . We claim that  $t > 1$ . Indeed, if  $t = 1$ , then  $f(z) = g(\sum e_1 k_i x_i) = k_1 g(x_1) \neq 0$  and hence  $z$  is a top element of  $A$  of type  $e_1$ . By (2)(i) this implies that  $p_1 z \neq 0$ , a contradiction. Now set  $y = \sum_{i=t}^{mn} h(e_{r(t-1)} k_i x_{i-1})$ . By the minimal choice of  $t$ , we obtain  $p_{r(t-1)} y \neq 0$ . Using condition (1) and the choice of the  $r(i)$ , we further compute that  $p_{r(t-1)} y = q_{r(t)} z$ , and – invoking condition (2)(ii) – we conclude  $p_{r(t)} z \neq 0$ . But this is incompatible with our choice of  $t$ .  $\square$


As is backed up by the proof of Criterion 10, the hypotheses of this criterion entail the existence of an infinite dimensional phantom of  $S_1$  relative to  $\mathfrak{A}$ , a graph of which contains a subgraph






As mentioned earlier, the criterion works well for  $\mathfrak{A} = \mathcal{P}^\infty(\Lambda\text{-mod})$  when  $\Lambda$  is a monomial relation algebra. One of the reasons for this can be found in the following observation which shows how easy it is to get a chain of  $\mathcal{P}^\infty(\Lambda\text{-mod})$ -phantoms started in the monomial situation.

**Remarks 11.** Let  $\Lambda = K\Gamma/I$  be a monomial relation algebra, and suppose that the simple module  $S_1 = \Lambda e_1/J e_1$  has infinite projective dimension. If  $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_r$  are arrows  $\alpha_j : e_1 \rightarrow e_j$  ending in distinct vertices  $e_1, \dots, e_r$ , such that  $\text{p dim } \Lambda \alpha_j = \infty$  for  $1 \leq j \leq r$ , then




is a subgraph of the graph of a  $\mathcal{P}^\infty(\Lambda\text{-mod})$ -phantom  $C$  of  $S_1$ . More precisely, there exists a top element  $c \in C$  of type  $e_1$  such that  $\alpha_i c \neq 0$  for  $1 \leq i \leq r$ .

If, moreover, there exists a module  $M \in \mathcal{P}^\infty(\Lambda\text{-mod})$  with a graph containing a subgraph of the form



where  $x, y \in M$  are top elements of types  $e_1$  and  $e$  respectively and  $q$  denotes a path in  $K\Gamma \setminus I$ , then there exists a  $\mathcal{P}^\infty(\Lambda\text{-mod})$ -phantom of  $S_1$  whose graph contains a subgraph of the form



with respect to suitable top elements.

*Proof.* The second statement clearly follows from the first. To justify the first, we start by noting that  $\bigoplus_{1 \leq j \leq r} \Lambda \alpha_j$  is a direct summand of  $J e_1$ , due to the fact that  $\Lambda$  is a monomial

relation algebra. Let  $C \in \mathcal{P}^\infty(\Lambda\text{-mod})$  have a top element  $c$  of type  $e_1$ . To see that  $\alpha_j c \neq 0$  for  $1 \leq j \leq r$ , consider a projective cover

$$\pi : P = \Lambda x_0 \oplus \bigoplus_{i \in I} \Lambda x_i \rightarrow C$$


such that  $x_0 = e_1$  and  $\pi(x_0) = c$ . If we had  $\alpha_j c = 0$ , we could conclude that  $\Lambda \alpha_j x_0$  is a direct summand of  $\ker \pi = \Omega^1(C) \leq JP$ , because  $\Lambda \alpha_j x_0$  is a direct summand of  $JP$ , which is incompatible with our setup.  $\square$

While most of our applications demonstrate the use of phantoms towards a proof that  $\mathcal{P}^\infty(\Lambda\text{-mod})$  fails to be contravariantly finite, phantoms may also be helpful in finding  $\mathcal{P}^\infty(\Lambda\text{-mod})$ -approximations.

**Example 12.** [2, Example on p. 137] Let  $\Lambda = K\Gamma/I$  be based on the quiver

$$\alpha \circlearrowleft 1 \xrightarrow{\beta} 2 \xrightarrow{\gamma} 3 \xrightarrow{\delta} 4$$


such that the  $\Lambda e_i$  have graphs:




Clearly,  $S_1$  is the only simple left  $\Lambda$ -module of infinite projective dimension. By Remark 11,  $S_1$  has a  $\mathcal{P}^\infty(\Lambda\text{-mod})$ -phantom  $A_1$ , with graph  $\begin{smallmatrix} 1 \\ \downarrow \alpha \\ 1 \end{smallmatrix}$ , and it is readily checked that there is no object in  $\mathcal{P}^\infty(\Lambda\text{-mod})$  having a submodule with graph  $\begin{smallmatrix} 1 \\ \alpha \searrow \nearrow e \\ 1 \end{smallmatrix}$ . One deduces that  $A_1 \rightarrow S_1$  is a (minimal)  $\mathcal{P}^\infty(\Lambda\text{-mod})$ -approximation of  $S_1$ .  $\square$

For non-monomial relation algebras, one often needs to slightly vary the idea of Criterion 10. We illustrate the construction of phantoms in such a non-monomial situation.

**Example 13.** Let  $\Lambda = K\Gamma/I$ , where  $\Gamma$  is the quiver



and  $I \subset K\Gamma$  is the unique ideal containing  $\gamma\alpha - \delta\beta$  and having the property that the indecomposable projective left  $\Lambda$ -modules have the graphs



We will see that  $S_1 = \Lambda e_1 / J e_1$  does not have a right  $\mathcal{P}^\infty(\Lambda\text{-mod})$ -approximation by constructing  $\mathcal{P}^\infty(\Lambda\text{-mod})$ -phantoms of infinite  $K$ -dimension. We start by observing that for each module  $M$  in  $\mathcal{P}^\infty(\Lambda\text{-mod})$  with top element  $m$  of type  $e_1$ , either  $\alpha m \neq 0$  or  $\beta m \neq 0$ . Thus the module

$$C_1 = \begin{array}{c} 1 \\ \downarrow \\ 2 \end{array} \oplus \begin{array}{c} 1 \\ \downarrow \\ 3 \end{array}$$

of finite projective dimension is an (effective)  $\text{add}(C_1)$ -phantom of  $S_1$  inside  $\mathcal{P}^\infty(\Lambda\text{-mod})$ ; a fortiori,  $C_1$  is a  $\mathcal{P}^\infty(\Lambda\text{-mod})$ -phantom of  $S_1$ . Since there exist modules in  $\mathcal{P}^\infty(\Lambda\text{-mod})$  having subgraphs



where  $x_1$  and  $y_1$  stand for top elements, namely

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \begin{array}{c} 1 \quad 5 \\ \alpha \backslash \quad / \rho_1 \quad \backslash \rho_2 \\ 2 \quad 5 \end{array} & \text{resp.} & \begin{array}{c} 1 \quad 6 \\ \beta \backslash \quad / \sigma_1 \quad \backslash \sigma_2 \\ 3 \quad 6 \end{array} \end{array}$$

and since each  $M \in \mathcal{P}^\infty(\Lambda\text{-mod})$  with a top element  $m$  of type  $e_5$  (resp.  $e_6$ ) satisfies  $\rho_2 m \neq 0$  (resp.  $\sigma_2 m \neq 0$ ), the module

$$C_2 = \begin{array}{c} 1 \quad 5 \\ \alpha \backslash \quad / \rho_1 \quad \backslash \rho_2 \\ 2 \quad 5 \end{array} \oplus \begin{array}{c} 1 \quad 6 \\ \beta \backslash \quad / \sigma_1 \quad \backslash \sigma_2 \\ 3 \quad 6 \end{array}$$

is an  $\text{add}(C_2)$ -phantom of  $S_1$  inside  $\mathcal{P}^\infty(\Lambda\text{-mod})$ .

In the next step, we observe that  $\mathcal{P}^\infty(\Lambda\text{-mod})$  contains objects with subgraphs

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \begin{array}{c} 1 \quad 5 \quad 7 \\ \alpha \backslash \quad / \rho_1 \quad \backslash \rho_2 \quad / \rho_3 \\ 2 \quad 5 \end{array} & \text{resp.} & \begin{array}{c} 1 \quad 6 \quad 8 \\ \beta \backslash \quad / \sigma_1 \quad \backslash \sigma_2 \quad / \sigma_3 \\ 3 \quad 6 \end{array} \end{array}$$

where again  $x_1$  and  $x_2$ , resp.  $y_1$  and  $y_2$ , denote top elements, and since each module  $M \in \mathcal{P}^\infty(\Lambda\text{-mod})$  with top element  $m$  of type  $e_7$  (resp.  $e_8$ ) satisfies  $\rho_4 m \neq 0$  (resp.  $\sigma_4 m \neq 0$ ) the module

$$C_3 = \begin{array}{c} 1 \quad 5 \quad 7 \\ \alpha \backslash \quad / \rho_1 \quad \backslash \rho_2 \quad / \rho_3 \quad \backslash \rho_4 \\ 2 \quad 5 \quad 5 \end{array} \oplus \begin{array}{c} 1 \quad 6 \quad 8 \\ \beta \backslash \quad / \sigma_1 \quad \backslash \sigma_2 \quad / \sigma_3 \quad \backslash \sigma_4 \\ 3 \quad 6 \quad 6 \end{array}$$

is an effective  $\text{add}(C_3)$ -phantom of  $S_1$  inside  $\mathcal{P}^\infty(\Lambda\text{-mod})$ . A fortiori,  $C_3$  is a  $\mathcal{P}^\infty(\Lambda\text{-mod})$ -phantom inside  $\mathcal{P}^\infty(\Lambda\text{-mod})$ .

Proceeding in this fashion, we obtain modules  $C_n \in \mathcal{P}^\infty(\Lambda\text{-mod})$  of length  $4n$ , namely

$$C_n = \begin{array}{c} 1 \quad 5 \quad 7 \quad \dots \quad 7 \\ \backslash \quad / \quad \backslash \quad / \quad \backslash \quad / \quad \backslash \quad / \quad \backslash \quad / \\ 2 \quad 5 \quad 5 \quad 5 \quad 5 \quad 5 \end{array} \oplus \begin{array}{c} 1 \quad 6 \quad 8 \quad \dots \quad 8 \\ \backslash \quad / \quad \backslash \quad / \quad \backslash \quad / \quad \backslash \quad / \quad \backslash \quad / \\ 3 \quad 6 \quad 6 \quad 6 \quad 6 \quad 6 \end{array}$$

all of which are  $\mathcal{P}^\infty(\Lambda\text{-mod})$ -phantoms of  $S_1$  of the first kind. This yields the  $\mathcal{P}^\infty(\Lambda\text{-mod})$ -phantom  $\varinjlim C_n$  of infinite  $K$ -dimension, and shows that  $S_1$  fails to have a  $\mathcal{P}^\infty(\Lambda\text{-mod})$ -approximation inside  $\mathcal{P}^\infty(\Lambda\text{-mod})$ .  $\square$

**Problem 14.** Characterize the simple modules over monomial relation algebras which fail to have right  $\mathcal{P}^\infty(\Lambda\text{-mod})$ -approximations in terms of their infinite dimensional phantoms.

4. CONTRAVARIANT FINITENESS OF  $\mathcal{P}^\infty(\Lambda\text{-mod})$   
AND THE INEQUALITY  $\text{fin dim } \Lambda < \text{Fin dim } \Lambda$


We apply Criterion 10 to a less elementary example which, in fact, motivated a major portion of this article. Namely, we show that, for the finite dimensional monomial relation algebra  $\Lambda$  of [8] with  $\text{fin dim } \Lambda < \text{Fin dim } \Lambda$ , the category  $\mathcal{P}^\infty(\Lambda\text{-mod})$  is not contravariantly finite.

**Example 15.** We refer the reader to [8, p. 378] for a definition of  $\Lambda = K\Gamma/I$ . We will apply Criterion 10 to show that the simple module  $S_2 = \Lambda e_2/J e_2$  fails to have a right  $\mathcal{P}^\infty(\Lambda\text{-mod})$ -approximation. For that purpose, we let  $\mathfrak{A} = \mathcal{P}^\infty(\Lambda\text{-mod})$ , set  $m = 1$ , and focus on the single primitive idempotent  $e_2$ . Moreover, we make the choices  $p = \gamma_1$  and  $q = \gamma_2 + \tau\gamma_2$ , let  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , and set  $x_i = e_2$  for  $i = 1, \dots, n$ .

First we exhibit modules  $M_n$  as in part (1) of the criterion. Namely, we define

$$M_n = \left( \bigoplus_{i=1}^n \Lambda x_i \right) / \left( \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \Lambda z_i \right),$$

where  $z_i = px_i - qx_{i+1}$  for  $1 \leq i \leq n-1$ . Observe that  $M_n \in \mathcal{P}^\infty(\Lambda\text{-mod})$  for each  $n$ . Indeed, the sum  $\sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \Lambda z_i$  is direct and can be seen to have finite projective dimension as follows: The graph of  $\Lambda z_i$  relative to the top element  $z_i$  is




whence the graphical method of [7, Section 5] yields  $\Omega^1(\Lambda z_i) = \begin{pmatrix} c_1 \\ | \chi'_1 \\ c_1 \end{pmatrix} \oplus \begin{pmatrix} c_2 \\ | \chi'_2 \\ c_2 \end{pmatrix}$ . Thus

$$\Omega^1 \left( \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \Lambda z_i \right) \cong (\Lambda e(c_1))^{n-1} \oplus (\Lambda e(c_2))^{n-1}$$

is projective as required.


To check condition (2)(i) of Criterion 10, suppose that  $C$  belongs to  $\mathcal{P}^\infty(\Lambda\text{-mod})$  and has a top element  $x$  of type  $e_2$ . Then  $px = \gamma_1 x \neq 0$ , since otherwise  $\Omega^1(C)$  would have a direct summand isomorphic to the left ideal  $\Lambda\gamma_1$ . But this left ideal has infinite projective dimension, as can again be checked with the aid of its graph



and the method of [7]. This shows that condition (2)(i) is indeed met.

Finally, let us check that condition (2)(ii) of Criterion 10 is satisfied. Again let  $C \in \mathcal{P}^\infty(\Lambda\text{-mod})$ , and suppose that  $y, z \in C$  are such that  $0 \neq py = qz$ , where  $p$  and  $q$  are as above. From the fact that  $qz = \gamma_2 z + \tau\gamma_2 z$  does not vanish, we deduce  $\gamma_2 z \neq 0$ , which in turn implies that  $e_2 z$  is a top element of type  $e_2$  of  $C$ ; this implication is an immediate consequence of the fact that the vertex  $e_2$  is a source of  $\Gamma$ . Consequently, the preceding paragraph yields  $pz \neq 0$  as required. Thus Criterion 10 applies to complete that proof that  $S_2$  does not have a right  $\mathcal{P}^\infty(\Lambda\text{-mod})$ -approximation.

An infinite dimensional  $\mathcal{P}^\infty(\Lambda\text{-mod})$ -phantom of  $S_2$  resulting from the preceding argument can be visualized as follows:



where again  $q = \gamma_2 + \tau\gamma_2$ .  $\square$

We believe that contravariant finiteness of  $\mathcal{P}^\infty(\Lambda\text{-mod})$  in  $\Lambda\text{-mod}$  is a condition strong enough to significantly impinge on the category of arbitrary (not necessarily finitely generated) left  $\Lambda$ -modules of finite projective dimension.

**Problem 16.** Decide whether contravariant finiteness of  $\mathcal{P}^\infty(\Lambda\text{-mod})$  implies equality of the little and big left finitistic dimensions of  $\Lambda$ .

## REFERENCES

1. J.L. Alperin, *Diagrams for modules*, J. Pure Appl. Algebra **16** (1980), 111-119.
2. M. Auslander, I. Reiten, *Applications of Contravariantly Finite Subcategories*, Adv. in Math. **86** (1991), 111-152.
3. M. Auslander, S.O. Smalø, *Almost split sequences in subcategories*, J. Algebra **69** (1981), 426-454.
4. W.D. Burgess and B. Huisgen-Zimmermann, *Approximating modules by modules of finite projective dimension*, J. Algebra **178** (1995), 48-91.
5. K.R. Fuller, *Algebras from diagrams*, J. Pure Appl. Algebra **48** (1987), 23-37.
6. M. Harada, Y. Sai, *On categories of indecomposable modules I*, Osaka J. Math. **7** (1970), 323-344.
7. B. Huisgen-Zimmermann, *Predicting syzygies over finite dimensional monomial relation algebras*, Manuscr. Math. **70** (1991), 157-182.

8. B. Huisgen-Zimmermann, *Homological domino effects and the first Finitistic Dimension Conjecture*, Invent. Math. **108** (1992), 369-383.
9. K. Igusa, S.O. Smalø, G. Todorov, *Finite projectivity and contravariant finiteness*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **109** (1990), 937-941.

FAKULTÄT FÜR MATHEMATIK, TECHNISCHE UNIVERSITÄT CHEMNITZ-ZWICKAU, POSTFACH 964, D-09009 CHEMNITZ, GERMANY

*E-mail address:* `happel@mathematik.tu-chemnitz.de`

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, SANTA BARBARA, CA 93106, USA

*E-mail address:* `birge@math.ucsb.edu`